

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 424 595

CS 509 899

AUTHOR Townsend, Rebecca M.
TITLE McCarthyism Revisited: Popular Press and Public Memory.
PUB DATE 1998-11-24
NOTE 38p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Communication Association (84th, New York, NY, November 19-24, 1998). Paper is a version of work from the author's Master's thesis.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Communism; Content Analysis; *Periodicals; Political Attitudes; *Political Issues; Politics
IDENTIFIERS Global Awareness; McCarthy (Joseph); *McCarthyism; *Retelling

ABSTRACT

National periodicals constructed their retellings of McCarthyism in problematic ways. They failed to remember the numerous actors who contributed to McCarthyism, and instead focused on Senator Joseph McCarthy as someone who took the necessary anti-Communism to an extreme. Periodicals held realist world views and clamored for objectivity in retelling the story of McCarthyism. This metonymical public memory supported a passive "tolerance" for McCarthyism. This memory is problematic, for it is a creative forgetting of the aspects of history which did not mesh with the orthodox view of the past. (Contains 71 notes and 73 references.) (Author)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

McCarthyism Revisited: Popular Press and Public Memory

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS
BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Townsend

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

By
Rebecca M. Townsend
Ph.D. Student
Department of Communication, University of Massachusetts
Amherst, MA 01003

National Communication Association
Public Address Division

84th Annual Convention
New York, New York

November 24, 1998

This paper is a version of work from my Master's thesis, "The Transformation of 'Tolerance' in the Age of McCarthyism: A Case of Problematic Rhetorical Remembrance," completed at Indiana University in 1997, under the guidance of Dr. John Louis Lucaites. His assistance is very much appreciated, as is the advice from Drs. Robert Ivie and Cherie Bayer.

Contact Information

Department of Communication
Machmer Hall Box 34815
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, MA 01003-4815

Phone: (413) 545-1311
Fax: (413) 545-6399
E-mail: townsend@comm.umass.edu

McCarthyism Revisited:
Popular Press and Public Memory

By Rebecca M. Townsend

Abstract

National periodicals constructed their retellings of McCarthyism in problematic ways. They failed to remember the numerous actors who contributed to McCarthyism, and instead focused on Senator Joseph McCarthy as someone who took the necessary anti-Communism to an extreme. Periodicals held realist world views and clamored for objectivity in retelling the story of McCarthyism. This metonymical public memory supported a passive “tolerance” for McCarthyism. I argue that this memory is problematic, for it is a creative forgetting of the aspects of history which did not mesh with the orthodox view of the past.

McCarthyite rhetorical practices consisted of several norms, including the metaphoric linking of deliberative discussion with stereotypically feminine qualities and the forces of chaos, the attacking of those who wanted reflexive consideration of potentially repressive measures, and the castigating of nonconformists as the enemy. Public deliberation over sensitive issues was restricted to those measures that were tolerable. It is my contention that McCarthyism narrowed the scope of possible meanings for “tolerance,” an important term in American, liberal-democratic public discourse. These norms harmed public deliberation because their initial instantiation and codification into law undermined the possibilities for serious political dialogue. The ways such norms have been narrated and retold have helped shape perceptions of the United States’ past, and in particular the transformation of “tolerance” from a warrant for pluralism to one for repression.

The collective memory of McCarthyism, as transmitted through national periodicals, helps to chart this structure of “tolerance,” as an argumentative warrant. In this essay I (1) explain that the reproduction of the McCarthyism narrative reduces a complex story to the excessive actions of a megalomaniacal individual that functions to reify a repressive understanding of “tolerance;” and (2) examine the re-membering of an historical event as a type of rhetorical remembrance. I argue in particular that national periodicals construct problematic retellings of McCarthyism that generate an ideographic *forgetting* that is ultimately harmful to democratic deliberation. They converge their retellings of McCarthyism to the figure of Senator McCarthy, which is a problem of rhetorical remembrance. How the United States, which professes to be a democratic republic, remembers McCarthyism and uses the term “tolerance” are serious matters, and through my analysis of periodicals I demonstrate how a repressive and

problematic understanding of “tolerance” gets re-affirmed. Even versions of the McCarthyism narrative which differentiate slightly from mainstream versions retain a likeness: the concern over how McCarthyism is to be retold. To facilitate this study, I have investigated the Reader’s Guide to Periodical Literature under the headings for “McCarthyism,” “(Joseph R.) McCarthy,” and “domestic anti-Communism.” These headings present a considerable number of articles with connections to the main concerns of this essay. I check these periodicals against the New York Times, a national newspaper, to see whether there is any substantial variation with a major newspaper in either point of occurrence or narrative substance.

Ideographic Re-Membering

As McCarthyists gendered deliberation and feminized dissenters to maintain positions of authority in the 1950s, they helped to sculpt the meaning of the word “tolerance.” It has been argued that McCarthyists equated “tolerance” with stereotypically feminized weakness.¹ They would affirm practices which called for the public to endure the strong anti-Communist measures for the sake of preserving American freedom. Such discourse effectively prohibited legitimate dissent from legislation such as the Internal Security Act of 1950 or the Communist Control Act of 1954 by characterizing it as “un-American.” “Tolerance” is important in American public discourse; its meaning is reliant upon usage. Without historical context, however, it is a word without much ideological import. As an ordinary language term, it can mean the “sympathy or indulgence for beliefs or practices differing from one’s own,” the “capacity for enduring or adapting (as to a poor environment),” or the “allowable deviation from a standard (as of size).” To tolerate may mean “to endure or resist the action of (as a drug).” Something can be “tolerable” as in “moderately good.”² Dictionary definitions categorize the possibilities for a

term's usage, but they fail to supply the meaning, since meaning is dependant upon actual, situated usage. Ordinary language terms attain their significance as ideographs when they are used to warrant positions within a rhetorically defined community, when they engender specific ranges of political meanings. The rhetorical culture of a community or a nation has access to a range of meanings, and the predominant usage of a narrowed definition is significant. In a sense, the affirmed meaning suggests and warrants certain practices and discourages others. In this essay, I want to explicate how such cultural markers as ideographs can develop rhetorical histories.

Ideographs and Memory

Ideographs are pivotal terms or phrases that members of a socio-political consciousness use to warrant particular lines of action. They are similar to often contested past phenomena (like traditionally conceived historical events) and likewise have their own histories. The pasts that they have can be described and examined. Unlike past events, traditionally conceived, however, ideographs are a distinctively rhetorical phenomenon that help to shape--and are in turn shaped by--the rhetorical culture. Past events, like wars, are potential moments in the histories of ideographs and can serve as interpretive springboards for the analysis of their rhetorical histories. I will explain how the synchronic and diachronic structures of ideographs facilitate the writing of such histories. These structures allow a rhetorician to view the process of change *in situ* and to craft a document of moments in that process. I will show how a part of the process of socio-political change is apprehended by the study of moments of rhetorical history and the study of ideographs. The study of ideographs can tackle the burden of memory as an example of creative remembering.

The vertical and horizontal axes of ideographs represent their diachronic and synchronic structures, respectively. The previous uses of ideographs, the “touchstones” of their past, as Michael Calvin McGee explains, demonstrate the constancy of an ideograph’s nature.³ They are precedents for present and future uses of such phrases. Defenders of “academic freedom,” an ideograph for members of academia, will rely on previous instances when the phrase served to justify radical scholarship. They will also recall when freedoms were in danger and the consequences of failing to protect them. Certain moments of the past which utilized the phrase combine in a vertical structure to show the potentials for the use of “academic freedom.” The cultural audience for this phrase concedes or rejects plausibility, and the meanings of the phrase develop over time. As McGee argues, “awareness of the way an ideograph can be meaningful *now* is controlled in large part by what it meant *then*.”⁴

The diachronic structure can be recorded in formal rhetorical histories. This structure can also be documented in a “more significant record” such as “novels, films, plays, even songs.”⁵ When a member of a community reads a magazine account of the debate over postmodernism in scholarship, that person may read about the varieties of scholarship “academic freedom” is to sustain. The periodical serves as a register of uses. Such registers help to socialize community members into the rhetorical culture.

The historical usages of ideographs are part of the burden of memory. Friedrich Nietzsche argues that “The knowledge of the past is desired only for the service of the future and the present, not to weaken the present or to undermine a living future.”⁶ And, while I may not be as ready to dismiss histories (in general) as fully as Kenneth Burke seems to be, I would agree that “A history of the past is worthless except as a documented way of talking about the future.”⁷

We face the present; we have to act. McGee has said that “time is an irrelevant matter in *practice*.”⁸ When confronted with a decision, we do not stop to recount all of the histories of similar situations. We may choose a few of the memories, and forget the leftovers. We need to forget in order to act. Nietzsche professes that “an excess of history makes [man] flag again, while without the veil of the unhistorical he would never have the courage to begin. What deeds could man ever have done if he had not been enveloped in the dust-cloud of the unhistorical?”⁹ Building on Nietzsche’s discussion of historical memory, Hayden White explains that “Nietzsche asked how a creative forgetfulness can be built up in opposition to the overpowering urge to remember which undercuts the will to act creatively, and the degree to which historical consciousness itself can be turned to the service of man’s innovating power, his power of self-transcendence.”¹⁰ Creative forgetting can aid in our daily living. As White explains, “When we ‘forget’ the past and future, we can ‘see’ the present clearly.”¹¹

Evidence of humanity’s creative forgetfulness can be found in the synchronic structure of ideographs. The present uses of ideographs illustrate the relationships between and among the competing ideographs available to a rhetorical culture. Celeste Michelle Condit and John Louis Lucaites define the horizontal structure of an ideograph as “[representing] its usage as defined by its relationship in public discourse to other ideographs relevant to the historically specific situation they are collectively employed to modify or mediate.”¹² The study of this structure entails untangling the conflicts and challenges terms in discourse have with each other. “Academic freedom” might lock horns with “responsible scholarship,” “truth,” “accountability,” or “time-tested, traditional methodology.” When discussed within the larger culture, “academic freedom” might be used to promote a political correctness argument, or in an alternative

scenario, it could be perceived as a “property” right worthy of defense. These other phrases are not necessarily in contest with the ideograph under analysis, but for particular instances they may be. These moments are significant, for they are points in the process of ideographic change. McGee claims that “Such instances have the potential to change the structure of ideographs and hence the ‘present’ ideology--in this sense, an ideology is dynamic and a *force*, always resilient, always keeping itself in some consonance and unity, but not always the *same* consonance and unity.”¹³

Functions of Ideographic Analysis

The study of the synchronic and diachronic structures of ideographs as rhetorical histories allows one to demonstrate the connections of past and present. Socio-political change can be studied in its constitutive, rhetorical dimensions. Simultaneously, such histories have a role in the sculpting of that process. To examine and craft the histories of rhetorical dimensions of the past, one needs to be aware of the needs of both the present and the past. “Freedom,” a highly significant ideograph in American public discourse, can at any synchronic moment come into conflict with a number of other ideographs in its cluster, depending on the needs of that moment. A scholar must look at the precedents for such moments and must tease out the conflict of terms that the “present” witnesses. These features are ready attributes of ideographic criticism.

I argue that “tolerance” steadies the meanings of other ideographs like “liberty” and “national security” in a particular historical interval. During the rhetorical phenomenon of McCarthyism, “national security” and “liberty” were said to be in danger. The interplay of these terms with “tolerance” in the McCarthyism of the late 1940s and early 1950s is already documented. Repressive “tolerance” served to sustain restrictions on “liberty” for the purposes

of “national security.” What remains necessary is a diachronic analysis of the time (and the subsequent uses “tolerance” serves) which has passed since McCarthyism’s transformative period. As the rhetorical narrative of McCarthyism is retold, particular versions of “tolerance” have been instantiated in public discourse. When members of society get socialized into understanding a particular usage of the story of McCarthyism, they subsequently learn particular uses of “tolerance.” A result of this process is that the citizenry is socialized to certain arguments and not others.

McCarthyism’s Retellings

A major formative political experience of the United States since the 1950s has been the phenomenon of McCarthyism. The national print media have shared in both the analysis of and the creation of the rhetorical culture of McCarthyism and could have distanced themselves from periods they find distasteful. Readers learn patterns of scapegoating from these periodicals and can also distance themselves from controversial rhetorical cultures of the past. W. Lance Bennett explains that the predominant focus of media outlets is on individuals. He outlines what this perspective hides:

In place of power and process, the media concentrate on the people engaged in political combat over the issues. . . . With actors at their center, news dramas emphasize crisis over continuity, the present over the past or future, and the impact of scandals on personal political careers rather than on the institutions of government that harbored them.¹⁴

By converging upon individual actors, media narratives disregard the larger forces of history.

Historical periods are incredibly complex, and attributing praise or blame is not always a worthwhile goal, nor is it an easy task to perform. Analyzing the media’s retellings of

McCarthyism is not intended to praise or blame. A major purpose, rather, is to understand better the complexities of this event, American public discourse during such a contentious period, and the process of public memory. I argue that national periodicals such as The Christian Century, The Nation, National Review, The New Republic, Newsweek, The New Yorker, Time, and U.S. News and World Reports constructed their retellings of this event in problematic ways as they engaged in a creative forgetting which proved harmful for American public discourse. In the following two sections I argue that periodicals constructed and repeated two predominant versions of the McCarthyism narrative, one from mainstream periodicals, and the other from partisan periodicals. Through use of metonymy, periodicals channeled their stories predominantly on Senator Joseph McCarthy as the sole man responsible for McCarthyism. This allowed most periodicals to continue to pursue an anti-Communist agenda, without linking the tactics of one with the objectives of the whole movement. Periodicals generally upheld a realist world view, resulting in fairly facile dismissal of alternative interpretations of events. This continued the McCarthyite rhetorical norm of discounting opposition against those who positioned themselves as the mainstream. Interestingly, all periodicals--no matter what the stripe--upheld objectivity as ideal for understanding McCarthyism. The mainstream periodicals encouraged a passive "tolerance" for the goals of the McCarthyist movement through their retellings of it. In the years since McCarthyism's most forceful pressure (1948-1954), each retelling of the narrative has been prompted by contemporary events. And the rhetorical demands of each such situation have entailed creative forgetting of the aspects of the ideographic history which did not mesh with the orthodox view of the past.

Mainstream Versions

Orthodox retellings of McCarthyism have relied heavily on a realist paradigm, similar to the norms of McCarthyism as it emerged after World War II. Francis Beer and Robert Hariman explain that in realist discourse, “nation states are the primary actors” in a world of chaos attempting to secure--by any means--“the ends of national interest defined in terms of power.” Taking a realist view of the world accounts for other perspectives on the world as “delusions” or “special pleadings.”¹⁵ In this way, a realist automatically discounts alternative perspectives as inherently flawed visions. McCarthyite rhetors would discount the legitimacy of opposition through several means. Through marking opponents (and opposition itself) to repressive legislation as irrational and feminine, and through rejecting the usage of “tolerance” to support pluralism, McCarthyist rhetoric positioned anti-Communism as the center position. This marginalized opposition and discarded the need for deliberative discussion. McCarthyist rhetoric perceived deliberative discussion as hindering action in a real world of power and strength.

Realist retellings of the McCarthyism narrative are framed against a crumbling post-World War II international world. Interpretations of historical events provided background to many stories in many periodicals. China fell to the communists in 1949.¹⁶ The battle against Communism abroad was evidenced in the number of U.S. war casualties in Korea.¹⁷ The Soviet Union, considered the master of these and other events, only understood power and would exercise its search for global domination through the use of spies and infiltration. Alger Hiss was treated as the tip of the iceberg of spies and Communist infiltrators.¹⁸ Of course, the only thing left to do was to expose the domestic subversives threatening to destroy U.S. civilization. Investigating committees scoured the nation in search of Stalin’s representatives, and so on.¹⁹

Joe McCarthy entered the scene. He spoke at Wheeling, WV and warned of Communists in the State Department. This charge required further investigations, performed with a feverish tempo by various congressional committees. McCarthyism, according to this version, exceeded the bounds of proper anti-Communism through McCarthy's relentless attacks on well-respected leaders and institutions, like the Army. Once McCarthy hit them, his reign of harsh investigation would falter. The Senate gloriously censured McCarthy. They claimed that McCarthy believed he was unbound by the traditional decorum of congressional behavior. The Senate was still staunchly anti-Communist; it had just cut McCarthy down to size. McCarthy quietly retreated from the spotlight and died while drowning his sorrows in a bottle.

In the earliest of the mainstream versions of McCarthyism narratives in U.S. News and World Reports the federal government instituted the "loyalty check" in 1947 as a means for protecting "national security."²⁰ The premise that the nation needed such checks was not questioned; it was at the core of anti-Communist rhetoric. Since the U.S. was presumed to be under attack from within, it was important to know who was loyal to the nation and who was not. Periodicals like U.S. News and World Reports urged caution in public behavior: they warned readers hesitant about joining organizations or signing petitions "If in Doubt [about a group's loyalty], Don't Join."²¹ This caution presumes that American people are easily duped by assumed Communist strategies for forming "front" groups. They would brief the public on new legislature under consideration by assuring readers that the detainment camps provided for under the Internal Security Act of 1950 would not be like those "in Russia and Germany" but would be solely for Communists and subversives.²² Americans were assured further that such measures were necessary, since "neither Republican nor Democratic leaders dispute" the problem of

Communists in government.²³ To claim that there was no dissension perpetuated exactly what proponents of the Act would claim. It was, as Time declared, a “problem which the U.S. had never squarely met.”²⁴

As the methodology of anti-Communist exposure of “questionable” citizens continued, Time described, “the Senate’s only woman member stepped firmly into the congressional ruckus over Communists-in-Government.” Time reported Senator Margaret Chase Smith’s speech on the matter and noted, “the Democrats would be justly accused of ‘complacency’ to the threat of Communism here at home and the leak of vital secrets to Russia through key officials in the Democratic Administration.”²⁵ The tactics which became known as “McCarthyism” needed to be understood, however, and Time was able to articulate a reason for its existence:

The policy of pretending that Communist influence on the Government didn’t exist can be called “Trumanism.” It is the real father of “McCarthyism”. . . . “McCarthyism” is going to be around until Harry Truman . . . eliminates from U.S. foreign policy the tendency to appease Communism.²⁶

The government’s apparent “tolerance” of un-American actions in the face of real danger prohibited debate over the premises of anti-Communism. The repetition of similar stories throughout the early 1950s began to set this repressive version of “tolerance” as the preferred usage.

The overwhelming pre-occupation of periodicals with McCarthyism (understood only as Sen. McCarthy’s rhetoric) in the early 1950s was also noted as a problem, for it might detract from the perceived need to focus on anti-Communism’s effectiveness. To counterbalance this overshadowing of anti-Communist efforts, Time analyzed “McCarthyism” as a “myth” which

was “busily fertilized not only by McCarthy [himself], but by one notable group of McCarthy’s enemies: the apologists for the New and Fair Deals.”²⁷ While Time chastised McCarthyism as extremist, it positioned itself as the middle ground of realism and rationality, a position that gave credence to anti-Communism. This central position among dangerous extremes also communicated an understanding of the U.S. political culture that authorized and necessitated repressive measures for the security of the nation. Extremism, as Time defined it, would harm that already-precarious security.

Periodicals portrayed the Government as losing patience with McCarthy’s tactics, and in the “spectacle” of the televised Army-McCarthy hearings, McCarthy’s ethos took a fall.²⁸ Indeed, Newsweek reported Eisenhower’s speech in which the president “refrained, as he always has, from naming names. But no one could doubt that Sen. Joseph R. McCarthy was his target.” Periodicals frequently added McCarthy’s name where it had not been mentioned, for it was easier to point to an easy, attractive scapegoat for anti-Communism’s “excesses.” Newsweek prefaced Eisenhower’s remarks with pointed reference to McCarthy as the agent of excess:

Then [Eisenhower] took note of McCarthy’s charges of treason against both the Democrats and the Republicans: “If we allow ourselves to be persuaded that every individual--or party--that takes some issue with our own convictions is necessarily wicked or treasonous . . . then indeed we are approaching the end of freedom’s road. Effective support of an idea . . . does not require--and can not tolerate--fear, threat, hysteria, and intimidation.” . . . He asserted that Americans are completely united in opposition to Communism.²⁹

Such remarks contained an irony that characterized anti-Communism: dissent could not be “tolerated” from Communists, since they were not characterized as a legitimate party and were therefore absent from the parties’ protections. They did not engage in dissent--it was called “subversion,” against which true “Americans” were “untied.” The marginalization of Communists in this way helped to create a rhetorical context that made Eisenhower’s speech seem logical and rational. Since Communism was so outside the bounds of protection, those who attracted too much attention in their opposition to it by attacking honored institutional members of government were also outside the bounds of protection and must not be “tolerated.”

Already a tension in the usage of “tolerance” was developing in the early (1948-1954) mainstream periodicals. “Tolerance” could warrant both widespread, far-reaching anti-Communist measures and the need for quieter, less ostentatious anti-Communism. Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas added yet another strand of usage to the range for “tolerance” in the January 13, 1952 issue of The New York Times Magazine:

There is an ominous trend in this nation. We are developing tolerance only for the orthodox point of view on world affairs, intolerance for new or different approaches. . . . We have over the years swung back from tolerance to intolerance and back again. There have been years of intolerance when the views of minorities have been suppressed. But there has probably not been a period of greater intolerance than we witness today.³⁰

This thread, arguing for greater, widespread protection for freedom of speech, was rarely mentioned in mainstream discourse. The lack of similar rhetoric makes its inclusion notable. It is a prime example which demonstrates the pervasive anti-Communism of mainstream periodicals, and it points to the creative forgetting of such alternative ideographic history.

Periodicals would be more likely to note, as did Time, how “freedom must always be tailored to the facts of life--and the 20th century facts of life demand great sacrifices. The cry of defiance, however noisy, however muted, is not always the voice of liberty.”³¹ “Liberty” needed to have limits, and Americans were encouraged to accept them for the survival of the nation.

“Tolerance” had been used to support “freedom of speech,” yet most national periodicals--except a small handful with leftist leanings--excluded such possible warrants.

In the 1960s, the predominant picture of McCarthyism in mainstream periodicals remained fixed on Senator McCarthy, and the discussion of anti-Communism in general remained set in realist terms. Reviews of books like Theodore Draper’s The Roots of American Communism and Richard H. Rovere’s biography of McCarthy would occasion a recollection of the recent past. Periodicals typically would judge authors on their “objectivity.” Time said that Draper had “stiff objectivity--rare among ex-leftists.”³² In reviewing Rovere’s book, the New Yorker wrote that it was “breathtakingly levelheaded” and “dispassionate,” arguing that “When we cease to regard McCarthy as a creature of nightmare, the story of his career [and] all the tragedies it contains, [it takes on] some of the aspects of low comedy and becomes a sort of squalid satire on the art of politics in America.”³³ By regarding the one senator as a fiend from a nightmare, the New Yorker promotes the separation of McCarthy from the wider anti-Communist movement. It also sets up a view of American politics as somehow undeserving of such a brute, and it isolates the phenomenon of McCarthyism from the period’s rhetorical culture and of the whole of the U.S.’s past.

This separation was typical. The early 1950s were regarded by Time as “the bad old days.”³⁴ McCarthyism, typically remembered on the anniversary of McCarthy’s death on May 2,

1957, was a “bitter memory” which ended with McCarthy’s censure, reported Newsweek.³⁵

Those days may have seemed distasteful to recall, but the objectives and purpose behind them were apparently necessary. Newsweek wrote that Ray Jenkins, counsel for the Senate subcommittee in the Army-McCarthy hearings, “insists that despite McCarthy’s ‘recklessness,’ the Wisconsin senator did serve his country. ‘Communism did at that time pose a threat to U.S. security, as it does now, and Senator McCarthy exposed it. I feel the country owes him a debt for so doing.’”³⁶ Mainstream periodicals discussed the present state of “little public or congressional demand for more anti-Communist legislation.” When the Supreme Court ruled the McCarran Act of 1950 unconstitutional in 1965, Communists were still around, but they were “feeble.” Time claimed, “Thanks to the free institutions it would destroy, the Communist Party of the U.S. has survived all efforts to legislate it and prosecute it to death.”³⁷ This news was disturbing to David Lawrence, editor of U.S. News and World Reports, who argued in an editorial:

The problem [of Communists] cannot be solved by arguing that everybody is entitled to “freedom of speech” and that all groups may enjoy “freedom of assembly.” . . . It is one thing to allow an American citizen to express his views, and it is quite another to find Americans joining organizations financed by enemy governments and even directed by agents in this country. The first rule of self-preservation is to protect the nation against destruction by an enemy.³⁸

“Toleration” was still viewed as a problem that the country needed to overcome in order to save itself. Such rhetoric was a norm of McCarthyism itself, and the periodical literature helped to perpetuate it. The rising level of student protest and political activism spurred such rhetoric in

mainstream periodicals of the late 1960s. U.S. News and World Reports includes J. Edgar Hoover's perspective on the Black Power movement: "Mr. Hoover reported that . . . 'Since Communism thrives on chaos . . . the party leadership is also pleased with the disturbances on the campuses and the disruption of city life by war protestors and riots in the ghettos.'"³⁹ In this article, Hoover is not framed as offering his opinion; rather, he has "reported" the objective facts of the domestic scene. This authority and the legitimation of his opinion casts a shadow of illegitimacy upon protestors. Investigations out in the open were no longer feasible due to the rejection of more brash anti-Communists like McCarthy. The government learned that exposure failed to achieve a complete squashing of dissent and disagreement. The FBI's COINTELPRO, begun in 1956 and working overtime in the late 1960s, would be a covert way of attacking unorthodox groups and individuals. McCarthy was the problem: he was an extremist who detracted from the necessary anti-Communism.

President Nixon, when compared with McCarthy, was seen as a more effective anti-Communist. It is notable that periodicals generally fail to recall McCarthyism during Nixon's presidency. In one of the only 1970s mainstream periodical articles on McCarthyism, a review of The Nightmare Decade: The Life and Times of Senator Joe McCarthy, Peter Prescott of Newsweek states that books on McCarthy are needed, since "We were too young to fear McCarthy, too young to know that our civilization is a fragile thing and that therefore the senator was worth fearing." Moreover, he claims that "denunciations at this point are superfluous; if we are not to roll over such a clown again, we must understand the man--look at him, if possible, with charity--and then try to comprehend the nature of demagoguery and the conditions that left this country supine before a bully as ignorant and incompetent as McCarthy finally proved to

be.”⁴⁰ Through their reliance upon the bully-clown portrait of McCarthy without regard to the other cast of characters creating McCarthyism, such articles facilitate the cultural forgetting of McCarthyism’s widespread norms. They also reaffirm the usage of “toleration” which warrants measures designed to protect the weak nation.

While the U.S. assumed that ethical presidential leadership was without question, Watergate’s exposure by journalists jolted the country out of its blind faith. This provided another occasion for Newsweek to discuss McCarthyism, especially since the Army-McCarthy hearings and the censure of McCarthy helped to cement the representation of McCarthyism as the extreme corruption of democratic values. Watergate could thus be accessed through a similar lens: the tragic corruption of a single man. Since journalists played the active roles in “breaking” the Watergate story, they perhaps preferred to remember their own history in a similarly glorious fashion. They found their hero in Edward R. Murrow, who was credited with bringing about the destruction of Senator McCarthy, the man responsible for McCarthyism. In a celebratory piece on ““See It Now,”” a 1950s television news show with Edward R. Murrow, Newsweek could praise, on one hand, the “show with a thesis, which was simply that [McCarthy] was a demagogue and a liar,” and on the other hand, “Murrow’s brief, dispassionate analysis of McCarthy’s tactics.”⁴¹ The stress on tactics of anti-Communism highlights the “tolerance” of its premise, that the U.S. is wise in its “intolerance” of Communism. It also demonstrates yet again the metonymy with which periodicals remembered McCarthyism.

The New York Times, whose coverage of McCarthyism had previously corresponded fairly closely with magazines, offered significantly more material on McCarthyism in the 1970s than most mainstream periodicals. In an editorial applauding Senator Margaret Chase Smith’s

caution of moderation to student protestors, the New York Times argued, “[We do not] doubt that once a national reaction set in against the nihilism and intolerance of the extreme radicals . . . decent distinctions would tend to disappear.”⁴² Tension in the term “tolerance” is depicted here. Reminiscent of the 1950s urge for “tolerance” of self-censorship, the New York Times counseled protestors to quiet down, under the ironic presumption that they might drive the nation to repress them. The editorial recalls a former, problematic diachronic usage of tolerance for the same purpose it was used in the 1950s. Senator Smith was an individual of the 1950s who actively railed against McCarthy’s tactics. Two decades later her advice to students is significant, for she is portrayed as a counselor of moderation, yet in so doing in this occasion, her advice warrants self-censorship of the political left. In her 1950s critique of McCarthy’s tactics--and not his premise--the left was implicitly urged to silence. Radicals are marked as the “intolerant” members of society, who must keep their action to a minimum for the good of the center. The New York Times contributed to the repetition of metonymically remembering McCarthyism.

In commenting on Watergate and the use of the CIA, William Safire offered an editorial in the New York Times which identified a “new McCarthyism”:

the law must never be allowed to break the law; higher duties and greater causes are no excuse. Having undermined civil liberty in the name of national security, shall we now undermine civil liberty in the name of civil liberty? If we permit prosecutors to break their oaths--if we close our eyes to the new McCarthyism--then investigations of the CIA will be a farce, and all the agony of the past two years will be for naught.

Safire’s arguments allude to a greater argument: those who make and represent the “law” are not above that law. Investigation into the body that collects “potential smears,” the CIA, needs to

continue. Neither the public nor the government should “tolerate” breaches of secrecy to commit “actual smears.”⁴³ Safire’s assumption is that McCarthyism is something we should not have “tolerated” in the first place.

Few periodicals of the late 1980s took notice of the fact that the former Screen Actor’s Guild President who named names to investigatory committees in 1947 had just become President of the United States. The formation of the Senate Subcommittee on Security and Terrorism in 1980 occasioned, for the New York Times, a comparison to the Internal Security Subcommittee.⁴⁴ And a more explicit parallel was drawn by Charles Mohr of the New York Times between anti-terrorism and McCarthyism: “Jerry Berman, the legislative counsel for the American Civil Liberties Union” said, “We are not sure that some of the subcommittee may not wish to brand those who disagree with government policy as terrorists, foreign agents, or Communist dupes. That is McCarthyism, and we oppose it.” Members of the panel, however, did not make the link, and argued for loosening of the restriction on the FBI and CIA.⁴⁵ Terrorism began to emerge as the springboard for the historical memory of McCarthyism.

Newsweek, one of the only mainstream periodicals to break the silence on McCarthyism in the early 1980s contained a curiosity piece on the folks who make annual visits to McCarthy’s grave. Such defenders of McCarthyism “know persecution at its vilest.”⁴⁶ Other than that, however, only the New York Times gave much attention to McCarthyism in the 1980s. The New York Times included an editorial severing the connection between terrorism and McCarthyism: “The new subcommittee [on Security and Terrorism] isn’t a return of McCarthyism.”⁴⁷ The New York Times continued to locate McCarthyism’s origins in Senator McCarthy, preserving the

focus on the individual and not the phenomenon; consequently, this preserved the validity of anti-Communism.

This practice might be changing, or at least experiencing some tension, with the advent of the 1990s. Two months before the Oklahoma City bombing of the Alfred E. Murrah Building, Anthony Lewis wrote an editorial published in the New York Times. He recalled the Truman Administration's loyalty program as part of the general phenomenon of McCarthyism, and compared it to some new legislation: "Two weeks ago the Clinton Administration proposed a new piece of legislation that in important respects would take us back to those bad times. It has had no attention in the press: a sign of how inert we have become. The legislation is called the Omnibus Counterterrorism Act of 1995."⁴⁸ Lewis noted that "national security" was the stated reason the bill was needed, but he criticized the motives, policy, and effects the bill would have. The bombing has since given a sense of vindication to Clinton's proposal, which became law. The lack of a forceful nation state to compete with the U.S. has sent realists searching for other scapegoats. Whether the U.S. finds them in terrorism or Communism, enemies are still very much a part of the way our political discourse has been structured.

This is only one example, and Newsweek offers a counter to it with "How McCarthy Gave Anti-Communism a Bad Name." In this article, realism re-emerges as a forceful organizing structure. Author Diana Trilling argues, "With the evidence mounted of Stalin's murderous regime, and of the cruelties and injustices of the more moderate dictatorships which followed upon it, the refusal to speak in opposition to Soviet totalitarianism . . . continued to be viewed as chief proof of political tolerance and enlightenment." McCarthy "robbed anti-

Communism of its base in liberalism” and those who assume a position of “anti-anti-Communism” are engaged in a “refusal of truth.”⁴⁹

Trilling’s words summarize the attitudes toward McCarthyism which many periodicals held, concentrating on the man and avoiding the more complex and troubling aspects of the grounding for McCarthyism. For Trilling and many others, McCarthy caused too much trouble in his Red-hunting. McCarthy stood for the larger movement of anti-Communism. Liberal anti-Communists were greatly troubled by this connection. They failed to recognize a key premise of anti-Communism: Communists of all sorts and those who might be associated with them are inherently un-American and should not be “tolerated.” Moreover, they failed to draw the connection between anti-Communism and McCarthyism.

Untraditional Versions

To be sure, this was not the only version of McCarthyism to be found in national periodicals, which include conservatives, liberals, leftists, and a number of religious groups. In the conservative press, McCarthy, still responsible for the whole of McCarthyism, was extolled as “having mentioned that those with backgrounds of unrepentant pro-Communism should not hold down government jobs.” This position is regrettable in 1960, for “not the witches, but the witch-hunters” are to be exposed.⁵⁰ With the late 1960s the National Review began to complain about the “permissive” nature of Americans toward “the Soviet’s agents” and longed for the time when “America found it necessary to be more actively concerned.”⁵¹ The strictest adherents to the realist world view, conservatives stressed the dangers of the world. Indeed, conservatives were more likely to point out the horrors of Communist-controlled countries, suggesting that even if there was conformism in the 1950s, it was not to be compared to the torture others

received.⁵² Worried that media would focus only on McCarthy, conservatives worried that the real-world problems would be ignored, thus causing another round of “anti-McCarthyism.”⁵³

Partisan periodicals were concerned most about the representation of McCarthyism for the sake of historical memory. The Christian Century followed mainstream periodicals, for the most part, in its rhetorical reconstructions of McCarthyism. They made sure that “academic freedom” not be confused with “overlooking the character of communism” and be seen rather as “tolerating” an unpopular opinion.⁵⁴ “Toleration” was a cautious practice. It appeared better just to accept the limits on speech. They agreed that “there is a new intolerance, a fresh emphasis upon discipline of a sort. But,” they claimed, “it has an object.”⁵⁵

Those on the left were the only ones to note explicitly the change in warranted measures “tolerance” supported. Although the New Republic observed that, “The idea of censorship is in fact accepted without question among wide sections of American society,”⁵⁶ they maintained a liberal anti-Communism in their retellings of McCarthyism. In the early 1980s, when concerns over internal security resurfaced, they wrote that “The last thing the United States needs is a new round of McCarthyism. It does need a stronger defense, better intelligence gathering, and even safeguards against Soviet espionage.”⁵⁷ This position failed to account for the quiet investigations of New Left movements, which relied mainly on “intelligence gathering.” Theodore Draper, writing in the New Republic asked, “How much illiberalism should a liberal society tolerate or defend?” as he continued to stress Stalin’s ruthlessness in the Soviet Union.⁵⁸

The Nation feared that the premises of McCarthyism would be accepted even as it was condemned, arguing: “Unfortunately, almost every segment of the American political spectrum, including most liberals, allowed itself to fight the battle on McCarthy’s ground. They all

accepted the proposition that communism was a dangerous disease and then sought to argue that McCarthy's methods to combat it were wrong, or that given individuals did not in fact have it."⁵⁹ There were numerous examples of similar perspectives throughout The Nation, for they, being furthest on the left, had the most to be concerned about during McCarthyism and since then. This section of the left consistently used "tolerance" to support "free speech" arguments. Christopher Lasch, writing for The Nation, portrayed a very different view of the role of intellectuals in the early Cold War. He critiqued the standard of objectivity many liberal anti-Communists claimed and argued that it has serious ramifications: "the more intellectual purity identifies itself with 'value free' investigations, the more it empties itself of political content and the easier it is for public officials to tolerate it."⁶⁰ He spotlighted the tension "tolerance" held for many liberals as they contemplated their relation to government. He argued that this tension was creatively exploited by federal officials: "That dissenting opinion within the framework of agreement on cold-war fundamentals not only should be tolerated but can be turned into effective propaganda use abroad . . . [was] apparent, in the early fifties, to the more enlightened members of governmental bureaucracy."⁶¹ Not only did Lasch consider liberals to be deceiving themselves, but the general public would be in a more significant danger through their passive tolerance of repressive measures: "A society which tolerates an illusory dissent is in much greater danger, in some respects, than a society in which uniformity is ruthlessly imposed."⁶²

Both conservatives and those on the left worried more about the truth of McCarthyism, yet to different ends. Conservatives were concerned that McCarthyism would be touted by Hollywood as an unparalleled terror, thus miseducating American youth. So, for example, the National Review argued that college students at the University of Wisconsin "were much excited

to learn about the discrepancy between history and legend” about McCarthyism.⁶³ They feared its fictionalization. Directors were liable to take “poetic license” to support their “pet thesis” with “factoids.”⁶⁴ William F. Buckley Jr. asked, “Is fairly recent American history going down the memory hole?”⁶⁵ The Nation was also concerned about the writing of history. “McCarthyites . . . rewrote the history of the New Deal. Gone was the notion that the Roosevelt Administration represented a conservative attempt to save American capitalism.” Yet they did not appeal to an interpretivist historiography, for there was a “truth” that others were “distorting.” “History” they argued, “contains truth, and truth is one of the major obstacles to conservative revenge.”⁶⁶

The parallel that partisan periodicals shared was the concern over representation. They cared about the way the McCarthyism narrative was told and retold. The overwhelming majority of partisan periodicals argued in terms similar to the more mainstream periodicals, that McCarthy was the locus and therefore the representation of McCarthyism. This trend is interesting, since partisans were concerned over the writing of such history. Nevertheless, they continued with the mainstream periodicals in metonymically referring to McCarthyism as the product of one man. Through this practice, they affirmed anti-Communism and perpetuated the norms of McCarthyism. They discounted McCarthy as too extreme, neglecting the rhetorical complexities and the large number of other actors contributing to McCarthyism.

Rhetorical Histories for Living

Noam Chomsky warns of the creation of “an acceptable history.” When readers understand the past through its retellings in print journalism, they are accessing patterns as well.⁶⁷ Whether such a history is acceptable or challenging, readers access a perspective on the past. Overwhelmingly, the national print media frame McCarthyism as the evil doings of a forgettable

man, and so consequently, they deny and ignore the depth of its rootedness in contemporary American rhetorical culture. This focus on an individual also facilitates a vision of the rhetorical culture that was innocent, without transgression or harm. Ultimately, this focus instantiates an understanding of “tolerance” that is repressive.

Through their repeated separation of McCarthy from anti-Communism, of tactics from objectives, periodicals attempted to separate the form of McCarthyism from its content, or purpose. This is an impossible rhetorical move to perform, and the tensions highlighted by leftist magazines in comparison with mainstream magazines demonstrate this. Could one be an anti-Communist and still live in a pluralistic society? The prevailing rhetorical culture of McCarthyism inculcated this norm early in the Cold War, and it is this version of history, this “acceptable” version that has lasted through the years. As has been argued, one of the results of McCarthyism was the emergence of a dominant usage of “tolerance” which authorizes repression. The attempted separation of form from content in the McCarthyism narrative has perpetuated this warrant. As such, the citizenry is socialized to see that it is natural for governments to repress civil liberties, because the repressions are needed for exigencies of national security.

Part of the reason many periodicals argued this form/content separation was also due to the norms of objectivity and realism. If they were to ignore the “real” world of danger, periodicals were placed under the attack of fictionalization. They would lose their position of authority and legitimacy on the history of McCarthyism. This simultaneously upheld practices that helped to create McCarthyism: the discounting of alternative histories or arguments as irrational or unrealistic. By forgetting that McCarthyism was a complicated phenomenon,

periodicals were complicit in its norms; they constructed others' positions on the extremes in order to position themselves as the privileged center. Each periodical contended that it held a version of the past that was somehow the "true" version. None argued for a "useful" version. A critical rhetorical history of McCarthyism can perform such a function.

Rhetorical histories rooted in ideographic analysis are well suited for the life of communities. The diachronic and synchronic structures of ideographs make them fairly facile agents for creative rhetorical histories. Interpreting the significance and problems of certain transformations of ideographs can provide a community with a nonconformist yet usable history. Nietzsche argues that communities need histories. He puts the matter directly: "we need [history] for life and action."⁶⁸ Correspondingly, burdens are taken on honestly. Rhetorical historians face the task of providing a usable precedent at the right moment. Nietzsche argues, we must know the right time to forget as well as the right time to remember, and instinctively see when it is necessary to feel historically and when unhistorically. . . . the unhistorical and the historical are equally necessary to the health of the individual, a community, and a system of culture."⁶⁹

My interpretive focus has helped me to craft a necessary rhetorical history of the term "tolerance." Nietzsche warns, "For as we are merely the resultant of previous generations, we are also the resultant of their errors, passions, and crimes; it is impossible to shake off this chain. Though we condemn the errors and think that we have escaped them, we cannot escape the fact that we spring from them."⁷⁰ In this respect, a project on the tolerance of repression in the McCarthy era is pertinent, and, I argue, necessary. Until we honestly confront this tradition in our past, and see how we have been rhetorically socialized to tolerate things we should not, we

remain fairly secure in a history which perpetuates this type of argumentation. We may remain safe in our distaste for the practice of robust democratic deliberation. White notes the dangers in a repressive tolerance: “The kind of broad tolerance which Rankean historism, taken in excess, induces in man is ultimately harmful: ‘To take everything objectively, to be angry at nothing, to love nothing, to understand everything--makes one gentle and pliable.’”⁷¹

Notes

1. Rebecca M. Townsend, "McCarthyism's Rhetorical Norms," National Communication Association Convention, Chicago, 22 Nov. 1997.
2. "Tolerable, Tolerance, Tolerate." The New Merriam-Webster Dictionary 1989.
3. Michael Calvin McGee, "The 'Ideograph': A Link Between Rhetoric and Ideology," Quarterly Journal of Speech 66 (1980): 10.
4. McGee 10-11.
5. McGee 11.
6. Friedrich Nietzsche, The Use and Abuse of History, trans. Adrian Collins, 2nd Rev. ed. (New York: Macmillan, 1957) 22.
7. Kenneth Burke, Attitudes Toward History, 3rd ed. (1937; Berkeley, U of California P, 1984) 159.
8. McGee 12.
9. Nietzsche 8.
10. Hayden White, Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1973) 349.
11. White 360. Nietzsche also argues that "*You can explain the past only by what is most powerful in the present*" (40).
12. Celeste Michelle Condit and John Louis Lucaites, Crafting Equality: America's Anglo-African Word (Chicago, U of Chicago P, 1993) xiii.
13. McGee 13-14.
14. W. Lance Bennett, News: The Politics of Illusion 2nd ed. (New York: Longman, 1988) 23.
15. Francis Beer and Robert Hariman, eds., "Realism and Rhetoric in International Relations," Post-Realism: The Rhetorical Turn in International Relations (East Lansing, MI: Michigan State UP, 1996) 3-4.
16. "Absent Voice," Time 3 Apr. 1950: 17; "Stand or Fall," Time 3 Apr. 1950: 17-18; "Help Wanted," Time 27 Mar 1950: 20.
17. Harry S. Truman, "Plain Beyond All Doubt," Time 3 July 1950: 8; "U.S. War Casualties," Time 27 Aug. 1951: 18.

18. "The Elite," Time 16 Aug. 1949: 18-19; "'McCarthyism' v. 'Trumanism,'" Time 27 Aug. 1951: 18; "Of Cells & Onionskins," Time 1 May 1950: 17.
19. "Communist Control Plans," U.S. News and World Reports 10 Sept. 1948: 18-19.
20. "Battle Over Rights of Individuals," U.S. News and World Reports 7 Nov. 1947: 20-21.
21. "If in Doubt, Don't Join! Pro-Communist Groups Face Crackdown," U.S. News and World Reports 22 Sept. 1950: 20.
22. "About Rules for Communists," U.S. News and World Reports 29 Sept. 1950: 56.
23. "Communist-Control Plans," U.S. News and World Reports 10 Sept 1948: 18-19.
24. "The Congress: 'There Is a Danger,'" Time 25 Sept. 1950: 21.
25. "A Woman's Conscience," Time 12 June 1950: 19.
26. "'McCarthyism v. 'Trumanism,'" Time 27 Aug. 1951: 18.
27. "McCarthyism: Myth & Menace," Time 29 June 1953: 12.
28. "The Country: Looking and Deciding for Itself," Time 3 May 1954: 28.
29. "The McCarthy Story: The President Speaks," Newsweek 7 June 1954: 24-25.

30. William O. Douglas "The Black Silence of Fear," New York Times Magazine 13 Jan. 1952: 7, 37-8. [Qtd. in Ellen Schrecker, The Age of McCarthyism (Boston: St. Martins, 1994) 243.] Douglas also argued:

thought is being standardized . . . the permissible area for calm discussion is being narrowed . . . the range of ideas is being limited. . . many minds are closed. This is alarming to one who loves his country. It means that the philosophy of strength through free speech is being forsaken for the philosophy of fear through repression (244).

And,

The great, the critical danger is that we will so limit or narrow the range of permissible discussion and permissible thought that we will become victims of the orthodox school. If we do, we will lose flexibility. . . . We will become wedded to a few techniques, to a few devices. They will define our policy and at the same time limit our ability to alter or modify it. Once we narrow the range of thought and discussion, we will surrender a great deal of our power. We will become like the man on the toboggan who can ride it but who can neither steer it nor stop it. The mind of man must always be free. The strong society is one that sanctions and encourages freedom of thought and expression. Our real power is our spiritual strength, and that spiritual strength stems from our civil liberties. If we are true to our traditions, if we are tolerant of a whole market place of ideas, we will always be strong. Our weakness grows when we become intolerant of opposing ideas, depart

from our standards of civil liberties, and borrow the policeman's philosophy from the enemy we detest (246).

31. "Two Above the Law," Time 14 June 1954: 21.
32. "To the Yonkers Station," rev. of The Roots of American Communism, by Theodore Draper, Time 18 Mar. 1957: 114.
33. Donald Malcom, "The Dark Ages. . .," rev. of Senator Joe McCarthy, by Richard H. Rovere, New Yorker 27 June 1959: 83.
34. "Same Old Joe," Time 11 Mar. 1957: 18.
35. "Where Are They Now? The Army vs. McCarthy," Newsweek 5 May 1969: 16.
36. "Where Are They Now?" 17.
37. "Up from the Underground," Time 26 Nov. 1965: 26.
38. David Lawrence, "Treason Unpunished," U.S. News and World Reports 29 Nov. 1965: 116.
39. "'Black Power': Tool for the Communists?" U.S. News and World Reports 15 Jan. 1968: 14.
40. Peter Prescott, "Shabby Demagogue," rev. of The Nightmare Decade: The Life and Times of Senator Joe McCarthy, by Fred J. Cook, Newsweek 14 June 1971: 106.
41. "'See It Now,'" Newsweek 17 Jan. 1972: 83-84.
42. "Mrs. Smith's Good Counsel," editorial, New York Times 3 June 1970, late ed.: A44.
43. William Safire, "The New McCarthyism," New York Times 9 Jan. 1975, late ed.: A35. In another version of the "new McCarthyism," conservatives and businessmen fall victim to the "political terror" of liberals in the wake of Watergate. Also see Jeffrey St. John, "The New McCarthyism," New York Times 3 Nov. 1975, late ed.: A35.
44. "Alabamian to Head Revised Senate Security Panel," New York Times 14 Dec. 1980, late ed.: A36.
45. Charles Mohr, "Direction of Intelligence Debate in Congress Still Unclear," New York Times 21 Apr. 1981, late ed.: B12.
46. Jeffrey Adler, "The Lonely McCarthyites," Newsweek 28 May 1984: 11.
47. "McCarthyism?," editorial, New York Times 3 May 1981, late ed.: E20.
48. Anthony Lewis, "Back to McCarthy," New York Times 24 Feb. 1995, late ed.: A29.

49. Diana Trilling, "How McCarthy Gave Anti-Communism a Bad Name" Newsweek 11 Jan. 1993: 32-33.
50. "I Have Now in My Hand the Names of Four McCarthy Supporters," National Review 27 Feb. 1960: 128.
51. "The McCarran Act," National Review 18 Apr. 1967: 396.
52. William. F. Buckley Jr., "If You Have Tears," National Review 20 May 1969: 506. Refer also to the satirical article, "Remembering the Terror," by Joseph Sobran. National Review 5 Aug. 1983: 914.
53. William. F. Buckley Jr., "Tail Gunner Joe" National Review 18 Mar. 77: 350-1
54. Hugh Stevenson Tigner, "Academic Freedom and the Communist Teacher," Christian Century 28 Sept. 1949: 1136.
55. "Common Denominators," Christian Century 28 Oct. 1953: 1224.
56. "A Special New Republic Report on Book Burning," New Republic 29 June 1953: 9.
57. Morton Kondracke, "Here We Go Again. Search for Subversion," New Republic 31 Jan. 1981: 14.
58. Theodore Draper, "The Myth of the Communist Professors. The Class Struggle," rev. of No Ivory Tower: McCarthyism and the Universities by Ellen Schrecker, New Republic 26 Jan. 1987: 33.
59. Norman Redlich, "Reason in the Cold War: McCarthy's Global Hoax," The Nation 2 Dec. 1978: 612.
60. Christopher Lasch, "The Cultural Cold War," The Nation 11 Sept. 1967: 207. Lasch also argued that "The 'scientific' spirit, spreading from the natural sciences to social studies, tends to drain the latter of their critical potential while at the same time making them ideal instruments of bureaucratic control" (207).
- The freedom of American intellectuals blinds them to their un-freedom. . . . Their freedom from overt political control . . . blinds them to the way in which the 'knowledge industry' has been incorporated into the state and military-industrial complex. Since the state exerts so little censorship over the cultural enterprises it subsidizes. . . intellectuals do not see that these activities serve the interests of the state, not the interests of intellect. All they can see is the absence of external censorship; that and that alone proves to their satisfaction that Soviet intellectuals are slaves and American intellectuals are free men. Meanwhile, their own self-censorship makes them eligible for the official recognition and support that sustain the illusion that the American Government . . . greatly values the life of the mind" (207).

61. Lasch 208.
62. Lasch 211.
63. "The Testament of W.T. Evejue," National Review 18 Jun. 1960: 385.
64. M. J. Sobran Jr., "On the Screen: Joe McCarthyoid," National Review 18 Mar. 1977: 335-6.
65. William F. Buckley Jr., "Why are the Liberals Whitewashing?" National Review 14 July 1989: 60.
66. Alan Wolfe, "McCarthy Then and Now: Comes the Counter-Revolution," 31 Jan. 1981: 112.
67. Noam Chomsky, qtd. in W. Lance Bennett, News: The Politics of Illusion, 16.
68. Nietzsche 3. He continues, "Every man and nation needs a certain knowledge of the past" (22). "The fact that life does need the service of history must be as clearly grasped as that an excess of history hurts it. . . . History is necessary to the living man in three ways: in relation to his action and struggle, his conservatism and reverence, his suffering and his desire for deliverance" (12). "All living things need an atmosphere, a mysterious mist, around them. If that veil be taken away and a religion, an art, or a genius condemned to revolve like a star without an atmosphere, we must not be surprised if it becomes hard and unfruitful, and soon withers" (44). "Man must have the strength to break up the past, and apply it, too, in order to live. He must bring the past up to the bar of judgment, interrogate it remorselessly, and finally condemn it" (20-1).
69. Nietzsche 8.
70. Nietzsche 21.
71. White 354-55.

Works Cited

- "Absent Voice." Time 3 Apr. 1950: 17.
- "About Rules for Communists." U.S. News and World Reports 29 Sept. 1950: 56.
- Adler, Jerry. "The Lonely McCarthyites." Newsweek 28 May 1984: 11.
- "Alabamian to Head Revised Senate Security Panel." New York Times 14 Dec. 1980, late ed., A36.
- Barenblatt v. United States. 360 U.S. 109. U.S. Sup. Ct. 1959.
- "Battle Over Rights of Individuals." U.S. News and World Reports 7 Nov. 1947: 20-21.
- Beer, Francis and Robert Hariman, eds. "Realism and Rhetoric in International Relations." Post-Realism: The Rhetorical Turn in International Relations. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State UP, 1996. 1-30.
- Benjamin, Walter. "Theses on the Philosophy of History." Illuminations. Ed. Hannah Arendt. Trans. Harry Zohn. NY: Schocken, 1969. 253-64.
- Bennett, W. Lance. News: The Politics of Illusion. 2nd ed. New York: Longman, 1988.
- Brinkley, Alan. "A Swaggering Tradition: Buchanan Belongs to a Long Line of Fiery Populists who Burn Themselves Out." Newsweek 4 Mar. 1996: 28-29.
- "'Black Power': Tool for the Communists?" U.S. News and World Reports 15 Jan. 1968: 14.
- Buckley Jr., William. F. "If You Have Tears." National Review 20 May 1969: 506.
- . "Tail Gunner Joe." National Review 18 Mar. 77: 350-1
- . "Why are the Liberals Whitewashing?" National Review 14 July 1989: 60.
- Burke, Kenneth. Attitudes Toward History. 1937. Berkeley, U of California P, 1984.
- "Common Denominators." Christian Century 28 Oct. 1953: 1224.
- "Communist-Control Plans." U.S. News and World Reports 10 Sept 1948: 18-19.
- Condit, Celeste Michelle and John Louis Lucaites. Crafting Equality: America's Anglo-African Word. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1993.
- "The Congress: 'There Is a Danger.'" Time 25 Sept. 1950: 21.
- "The Country: Looking and Deciding for Itself." Time 3 May 1954: 28.
- Douglas, William O. "The Black Silence of Fear." 1952. The Age of McCarthyism. Ed. Ellen Schrecker. Boston: St. Martins, 1994. 243-46.
- Draper, Theodore. "The Myth of the Communist Professors. The Class Struggle." Rev. of No Ivory Tower: McCarthyism and the Universities, by Ellen Schrecker. New Republic 26 Jan. 1987: 33.
- "The Elite." Time 16 Aug. 1949: 18-19.
- Gadamer, Hans-Georg. "The Problem of Historical Consciousness." Trans. Jeff L. Close, Interpretive Social Science: A Reader. Eds. Paul Rabinow and William M. Sullivan. Berkeley: U of California P, 1979. 103-60.
- "Help Wanted." Time 27 Mar 1950: 20.
- "If in Doubt, Don't Join! Pro-Communist Groups Face Crackdown." U.S. News and World Reports 22 Sept. 1950: 20.
- "I Have Now in My Hand the Names of Four McCarthy Supporters." National Review 27 Feb. 1960: 128.

- Kondracke, Morton. "Here We Go Again. Search for Subversion." New Republic 31 Jan. 1981: 14.
- Lasch, Christopher. "The Cultural Cold War: A Short History of the Congress for Cultural Freedom." Towards a New Past: Dissenting Essays in American History. Ed. Barton J. Bernstein. New York: Pantheon, 1968. 322-59.
- . "The Cultural Cold War." The Nation 11 Sept. 1967: 207.
- . The True and Only Heaven: Progress and Its Critics. New York: Norton, 1991.
- Lawrence, David. "Treason Unpunished." U.S. News and World Reports 29 Nov. 1965: 116.
- Lewis, Anthony. "Back to McCarthy." New York Times 24 Feb. 1995, late ed., A29.
- . Make No Law: The Sullivan Case and the First Amendment. New York: Vintage, 1992.
- Malcom, Donald. "The Dark Ages. . ." Rev. of Senator Joe McCarthy, by Richard H. Rovere. New Yorker 27 June 1959: 83.
- Marcuse, Herbert. "Repressive Tolerance." Critique of Pure Tolerance. Ed. Robert Paul Wolff. Boston: Beacon, 1965. 81-117.
- Mason, Noah. "The Red Menace." Cong. Rec. 24 Feb. 1947: A685.
- "The McCarran Act." National Review 18 Apr. 1967: 396.
- "McCarthy Goes Home--And He's a Martyr There." Newsweek 13 May 1957: 35.
- "McCarthyism?" Editorial. New York Times 3 May 1981, late ed., E20.
- "McCarthyism'--First Test." Newsweek 5 Apr. 1954: 23.
- "McCarthyism: Myth & Menace." Time 29 June 1953: 12.
- "McCarthyism' v. 'Trumanism.'" Time 27 Aug. 1951: 18.
- "The McCarthy Story: The President Speaks." Newsweek 7 June 1954: 24-25.
- McGee, Michael Calvin. "The 'Ideograph': A Link between Rhetoric and Ideology." Quarterly Journal of Speech 66 (1980) 15.
- Mohr, Charles. "Direction of Intelligence Debate in Congress Still Unclear." New York Times 21 Apr. 1981, late ed., B12.
- "Mrs. Smith's Good Counsel." Editorial. New York Times 3 June 1970, late ed., A44.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich Wilhelm. "Ancient Rhetoric." Friedrich Nietzsche on Rhetoric and Language. Ed. Sander L. Gilman. Trans. Carole Blair and David J. Parent. New York: Oxford UP, 1989. 3-193.
- . "On Truth and Lies in a Extra-Moral Sense," in Friedrich Nietzsche on Rhetoric and Language. Ed. Sander L. Gilman. Trans. Carole Blair and David J. Parent. New York: Oxford UP, 1989. 246-57.
- . The Use and Abuse of History. Trans. Adrian Collins. 2nd Rev. ed. NY: Macmillan, 1957.
- "Of Cells & Onionskins." Time 1 May 1950: 17.
- "Point of Order." Newsweek 8 Nov. 1965: 62.
- Prescott, Peter. "Shabby Demagogue." Rev. of The Nightmare Decade: The Life and Times of Senator Joe McCarthy by Fred Cook, Newsweek 14 June 1971: 106.
- Redlich, Norman. "Reason in the Cold War: McCarthy's Global Hoax." The Nation 2 Dec. 1978: 612.
- Safire, William. "The New McCarthyism." New York Times 9 Jan. 1975, late ed., A35.
- Sobran, Joseph. "Remembering the Terror." National Review 5 Aug. 1983: 914.
- "A Special New Republic Report on Book Burning." New Republic 29 June 1953: 9.

- "Stand or Fall." Time 3 Apr. 1950: 17-18.
- "The Testament of W.T. Evejue." National Review 18 Jun. 1960: 385.
- Theoharis, Alan. Seeds of Repression: Harry S. Truman and the Origins of McCarthyism.
Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1971.
- Tigner, Hugh Stevenson. "Academic Freedom and the Communist Teacher." Christian Century
28 Sept. 1949: 1136.
- "Tolerable, Tolerance, Tolerate." The New Merriam-Webster Dictionary. 1989.
- "To the Yonkers Station." Rev. of The Roots of American Communism, by Theodore Draper.
Time 18 Mar. 1957: 114.
- Townsend, Rebecca M. "McCarthyism's Rhetorical Norms." Thesis, Indiana U, 1997.
- Trilling, Diana. "How McCarthy Gave Anti-Communism a Bad Name." Newsweek 11 Jan.
1993: 32-33.
- Truman, Harry S. "Plain Beyond All Doubt." Time 3 July 1950: 8.
- "Two Above the Law." Time 14 June 1954: 21.
- "Up from the Underground." Time 26 Nov. 1965: 26.
- "U.S. War Casualties." Time 27 Aug. 1951: 18.
- "Where Are They Now? The Army vs. McCarthy." Newsweek 5 May 1969: 16-17.
- White, Hayden. Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe.
Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1993.
- Wolfe, Alan. "McCarthy Then and Now: Comes the Counter-Revolution." 31 Jan. 1981: 112.
- "A Woman's Conscience." Time 12 June 1950: 19.



U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)



REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: <i>McCarthyism Revisited: Popular Press & Public Memory</i>	
Author(s): <i>Rebecca M. Townsend</i>	
Corporate Source:	Publication Date: <i>(NCA)</i> <i>Nov. 24, 1998</i>

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS
BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1



Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN
MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA
FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY,
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A



Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN
MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B



Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

**Sign
here,→
please**

Signature: <i>Rebecca M. Townsend</i>	Printed Name/Position/Title: <i>Rebecca M. Townsend/Ph.D. Student</i>	
Organization/Address: <i>Department of Communication, Machmer Hall Box 34815 University of Massachusetts Amherst, MA 01003-4815</i>	Telephone: <i>413-545-1311</i>	FAX: <i>413-545-6399</i>
	E-Mail Address: <i>townsend@comm.umass.edu</i>	Date: <i>10/13/98</i>

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:	<i>Requisitions</i> ERIC/REC 2805 E. Tenth Street Smith Research Center, 150 Indiana University Bloomington, IN 47408
---	--

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility

~~1100 West Street, 2nd Floor -
Laurel, Maryland 20707-3598~~

~~Telephone: 301-497-4080~~

~~Toll Free: 800-799-3742~~

~~FAX: 301-953-0263~~

~~e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov~~

~~WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com~~



088 (Rev. 9/97)

PREVIOUS VERSIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.